

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed April 7, 2004, claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claim 11 was objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but was said to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 25-34 were objected to. The Examiner suggested cancelling the withdrawn claims.

The Amendments

Claim 10 has been amended for clarity. Chemical structures which mirror those of claim 1 have been specifically inserted in the claim, and the bromination reaction described on page 14, lines 6-12 has been more specifically set forth in the claim. The amendment to claim 10 is supported by the specification as filed on page 14, lines 6-12, for example. As suggested by the Examiner, withdrawn claims 12, 13, 41 and 42 have been canceled to advance prosecution. Claims 25-34 have been amended to add a period at the end of the claims.

No new matter is added by any amendment, and all amendments are supported by the specification and claims as filed.

35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection

In the Office Action mailed April 7, 2004, claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Office Action stated "the instant claim is drawn to a method of brominating a triptycene derivative by reacting said derivative with N-bromosuccinamide. However, the claim does not recite any structure or formula for the triptycene derivative that is to be brominated, thereby rendering the claim indefinite."

In response, claim 10 has been amended to provide a structure and formula for the triptycene derivative to be brominated. The base structure in claim 1 has been inserted into claim

Appl. No. 09/974,716
Amdt. Dated June 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 7, 2004

10, and the bromination reaction on page 14, lines 6-12 has been inserted into the claim. It is believed this amendment overcomes the rejection.

Objection to the claims

In the Office Action mailed April 7, 2004, claim 11 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was said to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and all intervening claims. In response, claim 11 is dependent on claim 10, which is believed allowable in view of the above. Therefore, it is believed this objection is overcome.

In the Office Action mailed April 7, 2004, claims 25-34 were objected to because the claims lack a period at the end of each claim. In response, claims 25-34 have been amended to provide a period at the end of each claim. It is believed these amendments overcome the objection.

Appl. No. 09/974,716
Amdt. Dated June 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 7, 2004

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is believed that claims 1-11, 14-40, 43-44 are allowable.
Reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections and objections is respectfully requested.

Accompanying this response is a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement and the appropriate fee (\$180.00). It is believed that the present submission does not require the payment of any additional fees. If this is incorrect however, please charge any fees required, including any extensions of time required, to Deposit Account No. 07-1969.

Respectfully submitted,



Susan K. Doughty
Reg. No. 43, 595

GREENLEE, WINNER AND SULLIVAN, P.C.
5370 Manhattan Circle, Suite 201
Boulder, CO 80303
Telephone: (303) 499-8080
Facsimile: (303) 499-8089
E-mail: winner@greenwin.com
Attorney docket No. 74-00
June 8, 2004